

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION		
Requestor Name and Address:	MFDR Tracking #: M4-04-3086-01	
HOUSTON COMMUNITY HOSPITAL PO BOX 11586 HOUSTON TX 77293	DWC Claim #:	
	Injured Employee:	
Respondent Name and Box #:	Date of Injury:	
ZURICH AMERICAN INSURANCE CO Box #: 19	Employer Name:	
	Insurance Carrier #:	

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Rationale for Increased Reimbursement: "Carrier's explanation on EOB is 'No Mar' if there is no MAR fees should be reimbursed at usual and customary fees. On response to the 'Request for Reconsideration' it has listed what an ambulatory surgical center. We are not an ambulatory surgical center. There are no specific guidelines for a hospital. Therefore-fees should be reimbursed at usual and customary."

Amount in Dispute: \$7179.24

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "The provider has not submitted additional pertinent information and the carrier position remains the same."

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
3/13/2003	M	Outpatient Surgery	\$7179.24	\$0.00
			Total Due:	\$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Use of the Fee Guidelines*, effective May 16, 2002 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on October 31, 2003. Pursuant to Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, the Division notified the requestor on November 6, 2003 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.

- 1. For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason code:
 - M-No MAR.
 - Based upon that review, Zurich Insurance group will reimburse invoices based upon the following policies: (1)
 Ambulatory surgery and outpatient hospital surgery facilities in Texas at the Medicare rate + 20%...The attached bills have been reviewed in accordance with these policies and are deemed paid in full.
- 2. This dispute relates to outpatient surgery services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, 27 TexReg 4047, which requires that "Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, §413.011 until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission."
- 3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the

quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.

- 4. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the Texas Labor Code and commission [now the Division] rules, and fee guidelines, impact the disputed fee issues." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the Texas Labor Code and Division rules impact the disputed fee issues. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii).
- 5. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the submitted documentation supports the requestor's position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv).
- 6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement." Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor's rationale for increased reimbursement states that "Carrier's explanation on EOB is 'No Mar' if there is no MAR fees should be reimbursed at usual and customary fees. On response to the 'Request for Reconsideration' it has listed what an ambulatory surgical center. We are not an ambulatory surgical center. There are no specific guidelines for a hospital. Therefore-fees should be reimbursed at usual and customary."
 - The requestor did not provide documentation to demonstrate how it determined its usual and customary charges for the disputed services.
 - The Division has previously found that "hospital charges are not a valid indicator of a hospital's costs of providing services nor of what is being paid by other payors," as stated in the adoption preamble to the Division's former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline, 22* TexReg 6276 (July 4, 1997). It further states that "Alternative methods of reimbursement were considered... and rejected because they use hospital charges as their basis and allow the hospitals to affect their reimbursement by inflating their charges..." 22 TexReg 6268-6269. Therefore, the use of a hospital's "usual and customary" charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
 - In support of the requested reimbursement, the requestor submitted four redacted EOBs for services that are similar to the services in dispute. However, the requestor did not discuss or explain how the sample EOBs support the requestor's position that additional payment is due. The reimbursement methodology is not described on the EOBs. Nor did the requestor explain or discuss the sample carriers' methodologies or how the payment amount was determined for each sample EOB. The requestor did not discuss or provide documentation to support whether such payment, as reflected in the sample EOBs, was typical for the services in dispute.
 - The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

7. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g)(3)(C), and §133.307(g)(3)(D). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), §413.031 and §413.0311 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1 Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION		
Based upon the documentation submitted by the pa §413.031, the Division has determined that the requinvolved in this dispute.		
DECISION:		
		12/3/2010
Authorized Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date
		12/3/2010
Authorized Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Manager	Date

PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code §413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code §413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.